



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/815,021

03/30/2004

Timothy S. Farlow

12579-006001

1009

26161 7590 03/17/2008

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

CARDENAS NAVIA, JAIME F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4182

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/815,021	Applicant(s) FARLOW ET AL.	
	Examiner Jaime F. Cardenas-Navia	Art Unit 4182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. This **NON-FINAL** office action is in response to applicant's submission filed on March 30, 2004. Currently, claims 1-33 are pending.

Drawings

2. **New corrected drawings** in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because Figures 1-12 are informal and/or illegible. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. **It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length** since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. **The disclosure is objected to** because of the following informalities: A period needs to be added to the last sentence on page 2.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. **Claims 14-16, 24, and 33 are objected to** because of the following informalities:

Regarding claims 14, 16, and 33, “he” should be replaced with “the manager” to clarify the claims and avoid gender bias.

Regarding claim 15, “the step” should be changed to “the required step” and “the portion” should be changed to “the portion of the information” to clarify the claim.

Regarding claim 16, in the last line of the claim, “the portion” should be changed to “the portion of the information” to clarify the claim.

Regarding claim 24, both instances of “the content” should be changed to “the authored content” to clarify the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 21, 25-31 and 33 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 21, “similar” is a relative term, which renders the claim indefinite. The term is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. For purposes of examination, “similar” has been interpreted as having at least one commonality.

Regarding claims 25, 31, and 33, there are two instance of “an enterprise”, and then at least one instance of “the enterprise”. The claims should be amended to resolve this discrepancy. For purposes of examination, the second instance of “an enterprise” has been interpreted as “the enterprise”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. **Claims 1-33 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

Regarding claims 1-33, the claimed inventions do not accomplish a practical application. The steps of storing, delivering, displaying, entering, and accumulating information may be interpreted as involving no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea. The claimed inventions lack concreteness as well as usefulness and tangibility. To qualify as accomplishing a practical application, an invention must produce a “useful, concrete, and tangible result.” See *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02.

Regarding claims 17, 23 and 31, A “medium bearing instructions to cause a machine to” does not fall into one of the four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). Software, programming, instructions or code not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in a computer. When such descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases. Furthermore, software, programming, instructions or code not claimed as being computer executable are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in a computer. In contrast, when a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer and the

Art Unit: 4182

program, and the computer is capable of executing the program, allowing the program's functionality to be realized, the program will be statutory.

For purposes of examination, the claims have been interpreted as a properly claimed computer program product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. **Claims 1-8, 13, and 17-18 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Loofbourrow teaches a method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising:
storing information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (col. 4, lines 47-57), and
delivering for display to the manager on a user interface, a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 2, Loofbourrow teaches the policies or programs are associated with human resources events (col. 4, lines 47-57, col. 5, lines 16-27).

Regarding claim 3, Loofbourrow teaches the current context comprises occurrence of one of the events (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 4, Loofbourrow teaches the event comprises a human resources event associated with an employee who reports to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 5, Loofbourrow teaches the current context comprises information associated with the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 6, Loofbourrow teaches the information associated with the

Art Unit: 4182

manager includes at least one of: the manager's responsibilities, the manager's experience, the manager's demographic characteristics, and characteristics of the employees that report to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 7, Loofbourrow teaches delivering the portion of the information to the manager comprises serving the information through a web browser (col. 4, lines 34-46).

Regarding claim 8, Loofbourrow teaches enabling the manager to control interactively which portion of the information is delivered (col. 5, lines 44-50).

Regarding claim 13, Loofbourrow teaches the portion of the information includes information about employees who report to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Regarding claim 17, Loofbourrow teaches a medium bearing instructions to cause a machine (Fig. 1) to:

store information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (col. 4, lines 47-57), and

deliver for display to the manager on a user interface, a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 18, Loofbourrow teaches an apparatus (Figure 1) comprising:

storage to hold information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (col. 4, lines 47-57), and

a communication medium to deliver for display to the manager on a user interface, a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7).

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. **Claims 19-28 and 30-33 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1).

Regarding claim 19, Cunningham teaches a method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising:

enabling a user to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 25, 39),

storing the authored content in a manner that enables delivery of the content for display to a manager on a user interface (par. 24, 31), and

enabling a choice of which content will be delivered based on a current context in which the manager is working (par. 24).

Regarding claim 20, Cunningham teaches that the authored content is stored in a manner that enables the delivery of content for a given event independently of content for other events (par. 24, 25).

Regarding claim 21, Cunningham teaches that the user is enabled to author content for an event in a word-processing type interface that has a visual appearance similar to one that is displayed to the manager (par. 31, 33).

Regarding claim 22, Cunningham teaches that the author is enabled to organize the authored content by event (par. 24, 31).

Regarding claim 23, Cunningham teaches a medium bearing instructions to cause a machine (fig. 1) to:

enable a user to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 25, 39),

store the authored content in a manner that enables delivery of the content for display to a manager on a user interface (par. 24), and

enable a choice of which content will be delivered based on a current context in which the manager is working (par. 31).

Regarding claim 24, Cunningham teaches an apparatus (fig. 1) comprising:

an authoring interface to enable a user (a) to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise, the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise, (b) to store the authored content in a manner that enables delivery of the content for display to a manager on a user interface, and (c) to enable a choice of which content will be delivered based on a current context in which the manager is working (par. 24-26, 39).

Regarding claim 25, Cunningham teaches a method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising

Art Unit: 4182

accumulating information about usage by a manager within an enterprise of information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by the manager, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 26), and

making the usage information available to a compliance employee of the enterprise for analysis (par. 26).

Regarding claim 26, Cunningham teaches that the usage information is made available as a compliance report displayed by a browser to the compliance employee (par. 26, par. 31).

Regarding claim 27, Cunningham teaches that the usage information is made available as a usage report (par. 26, par. 31).

Regarding claim 28, Cunningham teaches that the policies or programs information is organized by events in the operation of the enterprise, and the usage information includes a usage report that shows usage by managers according to the events (par. 25, 26, and 31).

Regarding claim 30, Cunningham teaches that the usage information is indicative of whether the manager has read the policies or programs information (par. 26, 86-88).

Regarding claim 31, Cunningham teaches a medium bearing instructions to cause a machine (fig. 1) to:

accumulate information about usage by a manager of an enterprise of information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by the manager, the policies or programs being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 26), and

make the usage information available to a compliance employee of the enterprise for analysis (par. 26).

Regarding claim 32, Cunningham teaches a method (par. 7, lines 1-2) comprising:

enabling a user to author content about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by a manager of the enterprise (par. 39), the content being associated with events in the operation of the enterprise (par. 25, 26, and 55), the content for different events being authored and stored independently (par. 55), the content including original nouns or other words or phrases or descriptions that are used repeatedly and consistently (par. 44, department, job title, location and supervisor are used repeatedly and consistently), and

enabling the user to define substitute nouns to replace automatically all of the original nouns or other words or phrases or descriptions in all of the content for different events that is distributed to the manager through a user interface (par. 44, 45, when an employee changes job, location, department, supervisor, etc., this change is inputted through the interface and replaces all instances).

Regarding claim 33, Cunningham teaches a method (par. 7, lines 1-2) comprising:

displaying to a manager of an enterprise, information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are to be implemented by the manager of the enterprise (par. 25, 26),

enabling the manager to confirm electronically that he has read the displayed information (par. 26, 86-88), and

delivering the electronic confirmation to a compliance employee of the enterprise for analysis (par. 26, 86-88).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. **Claim 9 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 9, Loofbourrow teaches the information that is delivered includes general information and policy statements (col. 6, lines 24-30).

Loofbourrow does not teach identifying the policy statements in a visually distinct way in the user interface.

Official notice is given that identifying the policy statements in a visually distinct way in the user interface was a matter of common knowledge to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Some examples would include highlighting, bolding, larger text size, and different font.

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Official Notice does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the well-known advantage of drawing attention to important information by making the information visually distinct and the teaching

Art Unit: 4182

in Loofbourrow of customizing the “look-and-feel” of the system interface, possibly by the inclusion of graphic (col. 5, lines 1-7).

16. **Claims 10-12 and 14-16 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1).

Regarding claim 10, Loofbourrow does not teach that the portion of the information is associated with an action to be taken by the manager.

Cunningham teaches that the portion of the information is associated with an action to be taken by the manager (par. 25).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 11, Loofbourrow does not teach that the information includes descriptions of milestones associated with the action.

Cunningham teaches that the information includes descriptions of milestones associated with the action (par. 26).

Art Unit: 4182

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 12, Loofbourrow does not teach that the information includes descriptions of tasks that are part of the action.

Cunningham teaches that the information includes descriptions of tasks that are part of the action (par. 25).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Art Unit: 4182

Regarding claim 14, Loofbourrow does not teach enabling the manager to confirm that he has taken a required step with respect to the portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches enabling the manager to confirm that he has taken a required step with respect to the portion of the information (par. 55, 58, and 86-88).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 15, Loofbourrow does not teach that the step comprises reading the portion of the information.

Cunningham teaches that the step comprises reading the portion of the information (par. 55, 58, and 86-88).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would

Art Unit: 4182

have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Regarding claim 16, Loofbourrow teaches a method (par. 24, lines 1-2) comprising:

storing information about policies or programs of an enterprise that are associated with human resource events of employees who report to a manager and are to be implemented by the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57),

serving for display to the manager through a web browser (col. 4, lines 34-46), a portion of the information that has been selected based on a current context in which the manager is working (col. 4, lines 58-67, col. 5, lines 1-7, 44-50), and

the current context including at least one of: occurrence of one of the events, the manager's responsibilities, the manager's experience, and characteristics of the employees that report to the manager (col. 4, lines 47-57).

Loofbourrow does not teach:

the portion of the information being associated with an action to be taken by the manager, the information including at least one of: descriptions of milestones associated with the action, descriptions of tasks that are part of the action, or information about employees who report to the manager, and

enabling the manager to control interactively which portion of the information is delivered and to indicate that he has read the portion.

Cunningham teaches:

the portion of the information being associated with an action to be taken by the manager, the information including at least one of: descriptions of milestones associated with the action

Art Unit: 4182

(par. 26), descriptions of tasks that are part of the action (par. 25), or information about employees who report to the manager, and

enabling the manager to control interactively which portion of the information is delivered and to indicate that he has read the portion of the information (par. 55, 58, and 86-88).

The inventions of Loofbourrow and Cunningham pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Cunningham does not teach away from or contradict Loofbourrow, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

17. **Claim 29 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cunningham et al. (US 2007/0129953 A1) as applied to claims 25 and 27 above, further in view of Loofbourrow et al. (US 6,505,183 B1).

Regarding claim 29, Cunningham does not teach that the events include human resources events.

Loofbourrow teaches that the events include human resources events (col. 2, lines 35-56).

The inventions of Cunningham and Loofbourrow pertain to information management. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective

Art Unit: 4182

functions, as Loofbourrow does not teach away from or contradict Cunningham, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching in Cunningham that the information strategy can be used with another information management system (par. 28) and that any type of data can be stored for use with the information management system (par. 31).

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Beery et al. (US 2001/0037223 A1) teaches creating, maintaining, and controlling access to insurance carrier product and employee information.

Habichler et al. (US 2007/0203713 A1) teaches providing managers information about their employees.

Kymal et al. (US 2006/0253289 A1) teaches linkages between entities, process/product development attributes, strategies, and goals, providing information to administration through documentation, and visual analysis of data.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jaime F. Cardenas-Navia whose telephone number is (571)270-1525. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 9:30AM - 8:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

February 28, 2008

/Jaime F Cardenas-Navia/
Examiner, Art Unit 4182

/Thu Nguyen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4182